

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Ridgley et al, U.S. Patent No. 6,583,800 B1.

Claim 1 as amended now clearly defines over Ridgley et al, and a notice to this effect is respectfully requested. With respect to independent Claim 1 as amended, there is now recited a processing platform for calling user-defined parameters to reconstruct visual stimuli from previously recorded stored user-viewed visual stimuli in the database. Support for Applicant's amendment is found in Applicant's specification on page 15, lines 3-29. Applicant submits that Ridgley fails to teach or suggest calling user-defined parameters to reconstruct visual stimuli from previously recorded data stored in the database, but rather, only teaches moving forward and backward through an information hierarchy using a last in first out (LIFO) buffer. Accordingly, Claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art.

Claim 3, which is dependent on Claim 1, further defines Applicant's invention over Ridgley. Support for Applicant's amendment is found in the Applicant's specification on page 15 line 3 – page 16 line 14. Applicant submits that Ridgley fails to teach or suggest a browser interface that allows an operator to enter or change parameters that specify which articles of online content are to be reconstructed. Accordingly, Claim 3 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art for these additional reasons.

Claim 15 as amended is now clearly defined over Ridgley. Claim 15 as amended recites the “search database act involves identifying each unique instance of the article of online content and recording the unique identification (ID) assigned to its browser window.” Support for Applicant’s amendment is found in the Applicant’s specification on page 15 line 21 – page 16 line 14. Applicant submits that Ridgley fails to teach or suggest enumerating through each unique instance of other visual stimuli related to the original visual stimuli called by user-defined parameters, but rather, can only move forward or backward through the information hierarchy. Accordingly, Claim 15 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art as well.

Claim 18 as amended is now clearly defined over. With respect to independent Claim 18 as amended, there is recited “the search database act then enumerates through each instance of a child window with a corresponding reference to the parent window’s unique ID. The resulting data set includes the unique IDs of both the article’s original parent browser window, as will as the child windows which comprise the visual stimuli originally displayed to the user.” Support for Applicant’s amendment is found in the Applicant’s specification on page 15 line 21 – page 16 line 14. Applicant submits that Ridgley fails to teach or suggest a system that includes means for enumerating through each unique instance of content related to at least one child web page that is related to a parent web page. Ridgley fails to teach or suggest any enumeration through such a child

web page. Accordingly, Claim 18 is believed to be allowable over the cited prior art as well.

Applicant respectfully sets forth that all pending Claims 1-20 are in condition of allowance, and a notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

A three month Extension of Time is included herewith along with the RCE fee, no additional fees are believed due, however, the Commissioner is authorized to debit Deposit Account No. 50-1752 for any additional fees that may be due. If the Examiner has any other matters which remain, the Examiner is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to resolve these matters by Examiner's amendment where possible.

Respectfully submitted,



Robert C. Klinger
Registration No. 34,365

Please send all correspondences regarding this matter to:

Jackson Walker L.L.P.
901 Main Street, Suite 6000
Dallas, Texas 75202
Att: Robert Klinger
214.953.6000 (Office)
214.953.5822 (Fax)